1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 ANDREW JAMES MORRIS, 11 Petitioner, No. CIV S-02-0385 FCD GGH P 12 VS. 13 FREDERICK K. BROWN, et al., 14 Respondent. ORDER 15 Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding through counsel with a petition for writ of 16 17 habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitioner challenges his 1997 conviction for first 18 degree murder. 19 In the answer, respondent argues that this action is barred by the statute of 20 limitations. In his reply memorandum, citing 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1)(D) petitioner's counsel 21 argues that petitioner is mentally incompetent and that the limitations period began to run at the 22 time petitioner knew or reasonably should have known the basis of his claims. Alternatively, the 23 court finds that petitioner is arguing that he is entitled to equitable tolling due to mental incompetence. Laws v. LaMarque, 351 F.3d 919 (9th Cir. 2003). 24 25 ///// ///// 26

## 

Petitioner has proffered no evidence in support of his claim that his mental incompetence prevented him from filing a timely federal petition. Petitioner is not entitled to an evidentiary hearing based on counsel's unverified and unsupported allegations. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that petitioner is granted thirty days from the date of this order to submit evidence in support of his request for an evidentiary hearing; following receipt of that evidence, the court will determine whether an evidentiary hearing is warranted. DATED: 10/28/05 /s/ Gregory G. Hollows GREGORY G. HOLLOWS UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE ggh:kj mo385.fb